



Eden Environmental Citizen's Group, LLC

APR 04 2019

60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue

April 1, 2019

Page 2 of 16

April 1, 2019

Via US Mail, Certified

Walter Ebrahimi
Go Green Recycling, Inc.
2214 Robindale Avenue
Stockton, CA 95205

Re: 60-Day Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit Under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act ("Clean Water Act")

To Officers, Directors, Operators, Property Owners and/or Facility Managers of Go Green Recycling, Inc.:

This letter is being sent to you on behalf of Eden Environmental Citizen's Group, LLC ("EDEN") to give legal notice that EDEN intends to file a civil action against Go Green Recycling, Inc. ("Discharger" or "Go Green Recycling") for violations of the Federal Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act") 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, that EDEN believes are occurring at the Go Green Recycling facility located at 2214 Robindale Avenue in Stockton, California ("the Facility" or "the site").

EDEN is an environmental citizen's group established under the laws of the State of California to protect, enhance, and assist in the restoration of all rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, and tributaries of California, for the benefit of its ecosystems and communities.

EDEN formally registered as a limited liability company (LLC) association with the California Secretary of State on June 22, 2018; however, since at least July 1, 2014, EDEN has existed as an unincorporated environmental citizen's association with members who remain associated with EDEN as of the date of this Notice.

As discussed below, the Facility's discharges of pollutants degrade water quality and harm aquatic life in the Facility's Receiving Waters, which are waters of the United States and

described in Section II.B, below. EDEN has members throughout northern California. Some of EDEN's members live, work, and/or recreate near the Receiving Waters and use and enjoy the Receiving Waters for surfing, kayaking, camping, fishing, boating, swimming, hiking, cycling, bird watching, picnicking, viewing wildlife, and/or engaging in scientific study.

At least one of EDEN's current members has standing to bring suit against Go Green Recycling, as the unlawful discharge of pollutants from the Facility as alleged herein has had an adverse effect particular to him or her and has resulted in actual harm to the specific EDEN member(s).

Further, the Facility's discharges of polluted storm water and non-storm water are ongoing and continuous. As a result, the interests of certain individual EDEN members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by the failure of Go Green Recycling to comply with the General Permit and the Clean Water Act.

CWA section 505(b) requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under CWA section 505(a), a citizen must give notice of intent to file suit. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b). Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the State in which the violations occur.

As required by CWA section 505(b), this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit provides notice to the Discharger of the violations which have occurred and continue to occur at the Facility. After the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit, EDEN intends to file suit in federal court against the Discharger under CWA section 505(a) for the violations described more fully below.

I. THE SPECIFIC STANDARD, LIMITATION, OR ORDER VIOLATED

EDEN's investigation of the Facility has uncovered significant, ongoing, and continuous violations of the CWA and the General Industrial Storm Water Permit issued by the State of California (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001 [State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB")]) Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ ("1997 Permit") and by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ ("2015 Permit") (collectively, the "General Permit").

Information available to EDEN, including documents obtained from California EPA's online Storm Water Multiple Application and Reporting Tracking System ("SMARTS"), indicates that on or around November 24, 2014, Go Green Recycling submitted a Notice of Intent ("NOI") to be authorized to discharge storm water from the Facility. On or around May 26, 2015, Go Green Recycling submitted an NOI to be authorized to discharge storm water from the Facility under the 2015 Permit. Go Green Recycling's assigned Waste Discharger Identification number ("WDID") is 5S391025168.

2151 Salvio Street #A2-319
Telephone: 925-732-0960
Website:

Concord, CA 94520
Email: edenenvcitizens@gmail.com
edenenvironmental.org

As more fully described in Section III, below, EDEN alleges that in its operations of the Facility, Go Green Recycling has committed ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act, California Water Code §13377; the General Permit, the Regional Water Board Basin Plan, the California Toxics Rule (CTR) 40 C.F.R. § 131.38, and California Code of Regulations, Title 22, § 64431.

II. THE LOCATION OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

A. The Facility

The location of the point sources from which the pollutants identified in this Notice are discharged in violation of the CWA is Go Green Recycling's permanent facility address of 2214 Robindale Avenue in Stockton, California.

Go Green Recycling is a refuse and recycling collection, processing and disposal facility. Facility operations are covered under Standard Industrial Classification Codes (SIC) 5093 (Scrap and Waste Materials).

Based on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet for Sector N – Scrap Recycling and Waste Recycling Facilities, polluted discharges from operations at the Facility potentially contain PCBs; heavy metals, such as zinc, copper, chromium, iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as mercury, lead, arsenic and cadmium; total suspended solids ("TSS"); benzene, hydraulic fluids, battery acid, gasoline and diesel fuel, fuel additives, oil lubricants, brake and transmission fluids, chlorinated solvents, gasoline and diesel fuels; ethylene glycol; coolants; and oil and grease ("O&G"). Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm.

Information available to EDEN indicates that the Facility's industrial activities and associated materials are exposed to storm water, and that each of the substances listed on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet is a potential source of pollutants at the Facility.

B. The Affected Receiving Waters

The Facility discharges into a municipal storm drain system, which then discharges to the Calaveras River, a tributary of the San Joaquin River ("Receiving Waters").

The San Joaquin River is a water of the United States. The CWA requires that water bodies such as the San Joaquin River meet water quality objectives that protect specific "beneficial uses." The Central Valley Regional Water Board has issued its *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* ("Basin Plan") to delineate those water quality objectives.

The Basin Plan identifies the "Beneficial Uses" of water bodies in the region. The Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters downstream of the Facility include: Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN), Agricultural Supply (AGR), Industrial Process Supply (PRO), Industrial Service Supply (IND), Navigation (NAV), Water Contact Recreation (REC-1), Non-contact Water Recreation (REC-2), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM), Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Migration (MIGR), and Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN).

A water body is impaired pursuant to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d), when its Beneficial Uses are not being achieved due to the presence of one or more pollutants.

The San Joaquin River is impaired for Selenium, Salinity, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Electrical Conductivity (EC), Boron, Organophosphorus (OP) Pesticides (Diazinon, Chlorpyrifos), Oxygen-Demanding Substances (BOD/Algae, Ammonia, Organic N) Organochlorine "Legacy" Pesticides (DDT, Chlordane, Dieldrin, Toxaphene, etc.) Mercury, Pathogen-Indicator Organisms, E. coli, Fecal Coliforms, and Toxicity of Unknown Cause.

Polluted storm water and non-storm water discharges from industrial facilities, such as the Facility, contribute to the further degradation of already impaired surface waters, and harm aquatic dependent wildlife.

III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND GENERAL PERMIT

A. Deficient/Invalid SWPPP and Site Map

Go Green Recycling's current Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") and Site Map for the Facility are both inadequate and fail(s) to comply with the requirements of the General Permit as specified in Section X of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, as follows:

- (a) The Site Map does not include the minimum required components for Site Maps as indicated in Section X.E of the General Permit. Specifically, the Site Map fails to include the following:
- 1) on-facility surface water bodies;
 - 2) areas of soil erosion;
 - 3) locations and descriptions of structural control measures that affect industrial storm water discharges, authorized NSWDS and/or run-on;
 - 4) locations where materials are directly exposed to precipitation and the locations where identified significant spills or leaks have occurred;
 - 5) all areas of industrial activity subject to the General Permit.

(b) The SWPPP omits the date that it was initially prepared (Section X.A.10);

(c) The SWPPP is invalid because it was not certified and submitted by the Facility's Legally Responsible Person. In fact, the SWPPP was not certified by anyone. Pursuant to Section XII.K of the General Permit, all Permit Registration Documents (PRDs), including SWPPPs, must be certified and submitted by the Facility's authorized Legally Responsible Person;

Failure to develop or implement an adequate SWPPP is a violation of Sections II.B.4.f and X of the General Permit.

B. Failure to Develop, Implement and/or Revise an Adequate Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the General Permit

Section XI of the General Permit requires Dischargers to develop and implement a storm water monitoring and reporting program ("M&RP") prior to conducting industrial activities. Dischargers have an ongoing obligation to revise the M&RP as necessary to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

The objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the General Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the Facility, and it must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

1. Failure to Conduct Visual Observations

Section XI(A) of the General Permit requires all Dischargers to conduct visual observations at least once each month, and sampling observations at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location.

Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges.

EDEN alleges that between July 1, 2015, and the present, Go Green Recycling has failed to conduct monthly and sampling visual observations pursuant to Section XI(A) of the General Permit.

2. Failure to Collect and Analyze the Required Number of Storm Water Samples

In addition, EDEN alleges that Go Green Recycling has failed to provide the Regional Water Board with the minimum number of annual documented results of Facility run-off sampling as required under Sections XI.B.2 and XI.B.11.a of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, in violation of the General Permit and the CWA.

Section XI.B.2 of the General Permit requires that all Dischargers collect and analyze storm water samples from two Qualifying Storm Events ("QSEs") within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31), and two (2) QSEs within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

Section XI.C.6.b provides that if samples are not collected pursuant to the General Permit, an explanation must be included in the Annual Report.

As of the date of this Notice, Go Green Recycling has failed to upload into the SMARTS database system:

- a. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period July 1, 2015, through December 31, 2015;
- b. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period January 1, 2016, through June 30, 2016;
- c. One storm water sample analysis for the time period July 1, 2016, through December 31, 2016;
- d. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period January 1, 2017, through June 30, 2017;
- e. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period July 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017;
- f. One storm water sample analysis for the time period January 1, 2018, through June 30, 2018; and
- g. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period July 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.

Furthermore, pursuant to data collected from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA"), there were sufficient storm events occurring near 2214 Robindale Avenue in Stockton during Facility operating hours within the reporting years where required stormwater sample collections were missed to have allowed the Facility to collect at least the minimum number of storm water samples required by the General Permit.

3. Failure to Collect Storm Water Run-Off Samples during Qualified Storm Events

Pursuant to Section XI.B.1 of the General Permit, a Qualified Storm Event (QSE) is a precipitation event that both produces a discharge for at least one drainage area at the Facility and is also preceded by 48 hours with no discharge from any drainage area.

Go Green Recycling's samples collected as listed below are not in compliance with the General Permit because they were not collected during Qualified Storm Events as defined by the General Permit:

Sample Date	QSE Info
10/25/16	Not a valid QSE – 2nd consecutive day of rainfall
11/16/17	Not a valid QSE – 4th consecutive day of rainfall
11/29/18	Not a valid QSE – 3rd consecutive day of rainfall

4. Failure to Deliver Samples to a Laboratory within 48 Hours of Collection

Pursuant to Attachment H, Section 2 of the General Permit, Dischargers are to deliver storm water run-off samples to a qualified Laboratory within 48 hours of the date and time of physical sampling. Go Green Recycling's samples listed below were not delivered to the Facility's Laboratory in that time frame:

Sample Date/Time	Date/Time Laboratory Received Sample
10/25/16 7:30 am	11/03/16 4:00 pm
11/16/17 11:40 am	12/18/2017 Time not entered
11/29/18 8:30 am	12/14/18 1:15 pm

5. Failure to Sample Correctly for the Parameter of pH

Pursuant to Section XI.C.2.a of the General Permit, the storm water sample "holding" time for pH analysis is 15 minutes. Go Green Recycling's laboratory reports dated January 3, 2018 and December 28, 2018 for samples collected on November 16, 2017 and November 29, 2018 evidence that the litmus test for the Facility's pH was not conducted within the required 15-minute holding time.

6. Failure to Utilize the Correct Parameter Test Method

Table 2, Section XI.B.11 of the General Permit, specifies particular Test Methods for required sampling parameters, as listed below.

PARAMETER	TEST METHOD
TSS	SM 2540-D
Oil & Grease	EPA 1664A
Zinc Total (H)	EPA 200.8
Copper, Total (H)	EPA 200.8
Lead, Total (H)	EPA 200.8
COD	SM 5220C
Aluminum	EPA 200.8
Iron	EPA 200.7
Nitrate+Nitrite Nitrogen	SM 4500-NO3-E
Phosphorus	SM4500-P B+E
Ammonia (as N)	SM 4500-NH3 B+ C or E
Magnesium	EPA 200.7
Cadmium	EPA 200.8
Nickel	EPA 200.8
Silver	EPA 200.8
BOD	SM 5210B

Go Green Recycling's storm water analysis dated January 3, 2018 and December 28, 2018 for samples collected on November 16, 2017 and November 29, 2018 failed to use the proper Test Method of SM5220C for COD.

C. Falsification of Annual Reports Submitted to the Regional Water Board

Section XXI.L of the General Permit provides as follows:

L. Certification

Any person signing, certifying, and submitting documents under Section XXI.K above shall make the following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all Attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the

information submitted is, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

Further, Section XXI.N of the General Permit provides as follows:

N. Penalties for Falsification of Reports

Clean Water Act section 309(c)(4) provides that any person that knowingly makes any false material statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this General Permit, including reports of compliance or noncompliance shall upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years or by both.

On July 13, 2016, June 26, 2017, and June 5, 2018, Go Green Recycling submitted its Annual Reports for the Fiscal Years 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18. Mr. Fawad Ebrahimi signed the Reports under penalty of law. Mr. Ebrahimi is the current Legally Responsible Person ("LRP") for Go Green Recycling.

The Annual Report(s) included Attachment 1 as an explanation for why Go Green Recycling failed to sample the required number of Qualifying Storm Events during the reporting year for all discharge locations, in accordance with Section XI.B. Mr. Ebrahimi certified in the Report(s), under penalty of perjury, that the required number of samples were not collected by the Facility because allegedly there were insufficient qualifying storm water discharges during the reporting year(s) and scheduled facility operating hours.

However, records from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) website/database confirm that during the reporting years in question there were in fact sufficient Qualified Storm Events (QSEs) occurring near the Facility during or within 12 hours of the start of regular business hours to allow Go Green Recycling to collect the requisite number of samples. In fact, a nearby business uploaded all samples in accordance with the General Permit and did not have the same issue of lack of QSEs.

D. Deficient BMP Implementation

Sections I.C, V.A and X.C.1.b of the General Permit require Dischargers to identify and implement minimum and advanced Best Management Practices ("BMPs") that comply with the Best Available Technology ("BAT") and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BCT") requirements of the General Permit to reduce or prevent discharges of pollutants in their storm water discharge in a manner that reflects best industry practice, considering technological availability and economic practicability and achievability.

EDEN alleges that Go Green Recycling has been conducting industrial activities at the site without adequate BMPs to prevent resulting non-storm water discharges. Non-storm water discharges resulting from these activities are not from sources that are listed among the authorized non-storm water discharges in the General Permit, and thus are always prohibited.

Go Green Recycling's failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs and pollution controls to meet BAT and BCT at the Facility violates and will continue to violate the CWA and the Industrial General Permit each day the Facility discharges storm water without meeting BAT and BCT.

Specific BMP Deficiencies

On July 30, 2018, the Facility was inspected by Ms. Jenna Yang of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. During that inspection, Ms. Yang noted that overall the facility appeared clean and well managed, however there was an unauthorized non-storm water discharge observed.

Ms. Yang observed an unauthorized non-storm water discharge at the discharge location along Robindale avenue.

Ms. Yang issued a verbal warning to the Facility and thereafter sent an email to Mr. Ebrahimi. The email requested that the Facility provide a narrative summary explaining how the unauthorized non-storm water discharge will be prevented in the future and photos showing that there is no longer an unauthorized non-storm water discharge. Ms. Yang also requested that the Facility submit the document and photos to SMARTS by September 7, 2018 and notify her via email once the Facility completed these submittals in SMARTS.

E. Discharges in Violation of the General Permit

Except as authorized by Special Conditions of the General Permit, Discharge Prohibition III(B) prohibits permittees from discharging materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. Unauthorized non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit.

Information available to EDEN indicates that unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility due to inadequate BMP development and/or implementation necessary to prevent these discharges.

EDEN alleges that the Discharger has discharged storm water containing excessive levels of pollutants from the Facility to its Receiving Waters during at least every significant local rain event over 0.1 inches in the last five (5) years.

EDEN hereby puts the Discharger on notice that each time the Facility discharges prohibited non-storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibition III.B of the General Permit is a

separate and distinct violation of the General Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

1. Discharges in Excess of Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

The Industrial General Permit includes technology-based effluent limitations, which prohibit the discharge of pollutants from the Facility in concentrations above the level commensurate with the application of best available technology economically achievable ("BAT") for toxic pollutants and best conventional pollutant control technology ("BCT") for conventional pollutants. (General Permit, Section X.H.)

The EPA has published Benchmark values set at the maximum pollutant concentration levels present if an industrial facility is employing BAT and BCT, as listed in Table 2 of the General Permit. The General Permit includes "Numeric Action Levels" ("NALs") derived from these Benchmark values; however, the NALs do not represent technology-based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has implemented BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT. (General Permit, Section I.M. (Finding 62)).

Go Green Recycling's exceedances of Benchmark values identified in the table listed below, indicate that it has failed and is failing to employ measures that constitute BAT and BCT, in violation of the requirements of the Industrial General Permit. EDEN alleges and notifies Go Green Recycling that its storm water discharges from the Facility have consistently contained and continue to contain levels of pollutants that exceed Benchmark values as listed below.

These allegations are based on the Facility's self-reported data submitted to the Regional Water Board. Self-monitoring reports under the Permit are deemed "conclusive evidence of an exceedance of a permit limitation." *Sierra Club v. Union Oil*, 813 F.2d 1480, 1492 (9th Cir. 1988).

Go Green Recycling's ongoing discharges of storm water containing levels of pollutants above EPA Benchmark values and BAT- and BCT-based levels of control also demonstrate that it has not developed and implemented sufficient BMPs at the Facility. EPA Benchmarks are relevant to the inquiry as to whether a facility has implemented BMPs. [*Cal. Sportfishing Prot. Alliance v. River City Waste Recyclers, LLC* (E.D.Cal. 2016) 205 F.Supp.3d 1128; *Baykeeper v. Kramer Metals, Inc.* (C.D.Cal. 2009) 619 F.Supp.2d 914, 925; *Waterkeepers Northern California v. AG Industrial Mfg. Inc.* (9th Cir. 2004) 375 F.3d 913, 919 (concentration levels in excess of EPA benchmarks are evidence supporting the citizen plaintiff's contention that defendant did not have appropriate BMPs to achieve BAT/BCT).]

Go Green Recycling's failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs and pollution controls to meet BAT and BCT at the Facility violates and will continue to violate the CWA and the Industrial General Permit each day the Facility discharges storm water without meeting BAT and BCT.

2. Discharges in Excess of Receiving Water Limitations

In addition to employing technology based effluent limitations, the Industrial General Permit requires dischargers to comply with Receiving Water Limitations. Receiving Water Limitations found in Section VI(B) of the General Permit prohibit storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges to surface water that adversely impact human health or the environment.

Discharges that contain pollutants in concentrations that exceed levels known to adversely impact aquatic species and the environment also constitute violations of the General Permit Receiving Water Limitation.

Applicable Water Quality Standards ("WQS") are set forth in the California Toxics Rule ("CTR") and the Regional Basin Plan. Exceedances of WQS are violations of the Industrial General Permit, the CTR, and the Basin Plan. Industrial storm water discharges must strictly comply with WQS, including those criteria listed in the applicable Basin Plan. (See *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 191 F.3d 1159, 1166-67 (9th Cir. 1999).)

The Basin Plan establishes WQS for the San Francisco Bay and its tributaries, including but not limited to the following:

- Waters shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Waters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Waters shall be free of changes in turbidity that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are lethal to or that produce other detrimental responses in aquatic organisms.
- Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Information available to EDEN indicates that the Facility's storm water discharges contain elevated concentrations of specific pollutants, as listed below. These polluted discharges can be acutely toxic and/or have sub-lethal impacts on the avian and aquatic wildlife in the Receiving Waters. Discharges of elevated concentrations of pollutants in the storm water

from the Facility also adversely impact human health. These harmful discharges from the Facility are violations of the General Permit Receiving Water Limitation.

Further, EDEN puts Go Green Recycling on notice that the Receiving Water Limitations are independent requirements that must be complied with, and that carrying out the process triggered by exceedances of the NALs listed at Table 2 of the General Permit does not amount to compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations. The NALs do not represent water quality-based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has caused or contributed to an exceedance of a WQS, or whether it is causing adverse impacts to human health or the environment.

Section XX.B. of the General Permit provides that when a facility's industrial storm water discharges and/or authorized NSWs are determined to contain pollutants that are in violation of Receiving Water Limitations contained in Section VI, the Discharger must conduct a facility evaluation to identify pollutant source(s) within the facility that are associated with industrial activity and whether the BMPs described in the SWPPP have been properly implemented, assess its current SWPPP, and certify via SMARTS any additional BMPs identified which are necessary in order to meet the Receiving Water Limitations.

EDEN alleges that from at least October 25, 2016 to the present, Go Green Recycling has been in violation of the Receiving Water Limitations provision of Section VI of the General Permit, as evidenced by its exceedances of the applicable Water Quality Standards set forth in the Regional Basin Plan, indicated below.

Further, Go Green Recycling has failed to comply with Section XX.B of the General Permit. Failure to comply with the additional Water Quality-Based Corrective Action requirements listed in Section XX.B is an additional violation of the General Permit.

The following discharges of pollutants from the Facility have violated Discharge Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations of the General Permit and are evidence of ongoing violations of Effluent Limitations:

Sample Collection Date/ Sample Outfall location	Parameter	Unit	Sample Analysis Result	EPA Benchmark NAL	EPA Benchmark NAL Instantaneous Value	BASIN PLAN/CCR T22 Benchmark NAL value
2016-2017 Reporting Year						
10/25/16 SW-2	pH	SU	6.0	n/a	n/a	Between 6.5-8.5

F. Failure to Comply with the Mandates of the Regional Water Board

Pursuant to Section XIX of the General Permit, Regional Water Boards have general authority to enforce the provisions and requirements of the General Permit, including reviewing SWPPPs, Monitoring Implementation Plans, ERA Reports, and Annual Reports and requiring Dischargers to revise and re-submit PRDs, conducting compliance inspections, and taking enforcement actions.

As fully discussed above, the Regional Water Quality Control Board issued Go Green Recycling an Inspection Report Transmittal requiring that the Facility provide a narrative summary explaining how the unauthorized non-storm water discharge will be prevented in the future and photos showing that there is no longer an unauthorized non-storm water discharge, submit the document and photos to SMARTS by September 7, 2018 and notify Jenna Yang via email once the Facility has completed these submittals in SMARTS.

Go Green Recycling has failed to comply with those mandates as of the date of this Notice.

G. Failure to Comply with Facility SWPPP

Appendix 2 "Monitoring and Implementation Plan" of the Facility SWPPP indicates that the Facility will collect and analyze storm water samples from two qualified storm events within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31) and two QSEs within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

As detailed above, the Facility missed collecting storm water samples in the reporting years 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18, and 2018-19

Go Green Recycling may have had other violations that can only be fully identified and documented once discovery and investigation have been completed. Hence, to the extent possible, EDEN includes such violations in this Notice and reserves the right to amend this Notice, if necessary, to include such further violations in future legal proceedings.

The violations discussed herein are derived from eye witness reports and records publicly available. These violations are continuing.

IV. THE PERSON OR PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE VIOLATIONS

The entities responsible for the alleged violations are Go Green Recycling, as well as employees of the Facility responsible for compliance with the CWA.

V. THE DATE, DATES, OR REASONABLE RANGE OF DATES OF THE VIOLATIONS

The range of dates covered by this 60-day Notice is from at least July 1, 2014, to the date of this Notice. EDEN may from time to time update this Notice to include all violations which may occur after the range of dates covered by this Notice. Some of the violations are continuous in nature; therefore, each day constitutes a violation.

VI. CONTACT INFORMATION

The entity giving this 60-day Notice is Eden Environmental Citizen's Group ("EDEN").

Aiden Sanchez
EDEN ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZEN'S GROUP
2151 Salvio Street #A2-319
Concord, CA 94520
Telephone: (925) 732-0960
Email: Edenenvcitizens@gmail.com (emailed correspondence is preferred)
Website: edenenvironmental.org

To ensure proper response to this Notice, all communications should be addressed to EDEN's General Counsel, Hans W. Herb.

HANS W. HERB
Law Offices of Hans W. Herb
P.O. Box 970
Santa Rosa, CA 95402
Telephone: (707) 576-0757
Email: hans@tankman.com

VII. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

CWA §§ 505(a)(1) and 505(f) provide for citizen enforcement actions against any "person," including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements and for un-permitted discharges of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a)(1) and (f), §1362(5).

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five (5) years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. These provisions of law

authorize civil penalties of \$37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009, and \$51,570.00 per day per violation for violations that occurred after November 2, 2015.

In addition to civil penalties, EDEN will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law. Lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d), EDEN will seek to recover its litigation costs, including attorneys' and experts' fees.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The CWA specifically provides a 60-day notice period to promote resolution of disputes. EDEN encourages Go Green Recycling's counsel to contact **EDEN's counsel** within 20 days of receipt of this Notice to initiate a discussion regarding the violations detailed herein. Please do not contact EDEN directly.

During the 60-day notice period, EDEN is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations; however, if Go Green Recycling wishes to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, it is suggested those discussions be initiated soon so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-day notice period. EDEN reserves the right to file a lawsuit if discussions are continuing when the notice period ends.

Very truly yours,

AIDEN SANCHEZ
Eden Environmental Citizen's Group

Copies to:

Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Executive Director, State Water Resources Control Board
Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA – Region 9